



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,391	01/15/2004	You-seop Lee	249/436	4946

27849 7590 01/05/2007  
LEE & MORSE, P.C.  
3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE  
SUITE 500  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042

EXAMINER
----------

MRUK, GEOFFREY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2853

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/05/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/757,391

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Geoffrey Mruk

Art Unit

2853

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 19 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claim 1 dated 20 October 2006.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-10 and 21.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 22 and 23.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**STEPHEN MEIER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 19 December 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant's arguments that "The Hotomi et al. reference, on the other hand, does not teach, or even remotely suggest, such formation of ink droplets. Even though the Hotomi et al. reference teaches application of alternating voltage to different electrodes in order to form a non-uniform electric field within a printer nozzle, there is no teaching whatsoever of specific localized electrostatic control for the purpose of forming and moving ink droplets inside the nozzle. The mere disclosure of application of an alternating voltage to electrodes does not amount to disclosing or teaching formation and control of ink droplets inside the printer nozzle", is not persuasive. As stated in the final rejection, Hotomi discloses "the inking solution 1n within each of the nozzle 16x is retained in position in the critical condition, as described above, under the influence of the traveling-wave electric field curtain cyclically acting thereon so as to transport the inking solution 1n towards the associated orifice. Therefore, the inking solution 1n retained in the critical condition can readily be expelled outwards from the nozzle through the associated orifice, when even the slightest electric charge is injected therein, in the form of the ink droplet 1n' of a size corresponding to the amount of electric charge so injected" (Column 17, lines 10-20). Therefore, Hotomi meets the claimed limitations. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., The application of a voltage causes the surface property of the hydrophobic layer 130 at a location corresponding to the first and second electrode pads 151 and 152 to change to a hydrophilic property) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).